

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-9 remain pending in this application. By this amendment, claim 1 has been amended. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Adams (U.S. Patent No. 7,117,165), hereafter “Adams,” in view of Dougherty (U.S. Patent No. 6,003,666), hereafter “Dougherty,” and Gune (Paper # 20100718, US 7,131,071 incorporating by reference U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0204427), hereafter “Gune 427.” Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Adams and Gune, incorporating by reference Gune 427 as applied to claim 1. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Adams, Dougherty and Gune, incorporating by reference Gune 427 as applied to claim 1.

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Adams, Dougherty, Gune and Gune 427, Applicants assert that the cited references do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest dynamically generating an approval list for the item request based on application of a set of rules to the item, the set of rules including item-based rules and safety-based rules, the approval list being a hierarchy of approvers that includes all approvers, including all supervisors, financial personnel and safety personnel, from

which approval must be obtained. The Office admits that Adams does not expressly disclose that the set of rules include safety-based rules. Instead the Office relies on a passage of Dougherty that discusses national and international rules pertaining to safe transportation and handling of hazardous materials. However, in discussing these rules, Dougherty does not indicate that these rules are used to select an appropriate person to approve an item request based on safety rules. Furthermore, Dougherty in combination with Adams fails to teach or suggest a hierarchy of approvers that contains all required approvers and that this hierarchy includes all supervisors, financial personnel and safety personnel. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the rejection.

With respect to dependent claim 3, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references also fail to teach or suggest displaying, by the application, an informational message to the approver, prior to receiving the approval determination, at least a portion of the informational message pertaining to safety information. In contrast, the notifications in passage of Adams cited by the Office are simply event-based email messages. To this extent, the notifications in Adams are sent via a separate email system and not displayed in the application used for approvals. Furthermore, the subject matter of the notifications is of events and not informational in nature, much less including safety information. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the rejection.

With respect to the Office's arguments regarding other dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claim listed above. In addition, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. However, for brevity, Applicants will forego addressing each of these

rejections individually, but reserve the right to do so should it become necessary. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hunter E. Webb/

Date: August 3, 2011

Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)